

identify and prevent
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A5042
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PHOTOCOPY

AZ

FEB 10 2005

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA Date:

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Permanent Residence Pursuant to Section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966 (P.L. 89-732)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the District Director, Miami, Florida, who certified his decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for review. The District Director's decision will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Colombia who filed this application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act (CAA) of November 2, 1966. The CAA provides, in pertinent part:

[T]he status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba and who has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959 and has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, may be adjusted by the Attorney General, (now the Secretary of Homeland Security, (Secretary)), in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien makes an application for such adjustment, and the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to the spouse and child of any alien described in this subsection, regardless of their citizenship and place of birth, who are residing with such alien in the United States.

The District Director determined that the applicant was not eligible for adjustment of status as the spouse of a native or citizen of Cuba, pursuant to section 1 of the CAA of November 2, 1966, because she entered into the marriage for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States. *See District Director's Decision* dated July 1, 2004.

The record reflects that on May 24, 2002, at Miami Beach, Florida, the applicant married [REDACTED], a native and citizen of Cuba whose immigration status was adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident of the United States, pursuant to section 1 of the CAA. Based on that marriage, on July 23, 2002, the applicant filed for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

On July 30, 2003, the applicant and her spouse, [REDACTED] appeared before Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) for an interview regarding the application for permanent residence. The applicant and Mr. [REDACTED] were each placed under oath and questioned separately regarding their domestic life and shared experiences. Citing *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983), and *Matter of Phillis*, 15 I&N Dec. 385 (BIA 1975), the District Director maintained that when there is reason to doubt the bona fides of a marital relationship, evidence must be presented to show that the marriage was not entered into solely for the purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States. The District Director determined that the discrepancies encountered during the interview, and the lack of material evidence presented, strongly suggest that the applicant and her spouse entered into a marriage for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States.

On notice of certification, the applicant was offered an opportunity to submit evidence in opposition to the District Director's findings. In response to the notice of certification counsel submits a brief, two letters of explanation of the discrepancies from the applicant and [REDACTED] letters from the applicant's children, bank statements, copies of pay stubs, a warranty deed and other correspondence showing both the applicant and her husband's names on the documents.

In their letters the applicant and [REDACTED] attempt to address the discrepancies made by both of them during the interview and attribute some of the discrepancies to misinterpretation and bad translation from the

interpreter. In addition counsel states that although the applicant's children were present they were never asked any questions.

The interview was videotaped and at no point during the interview did the applicant or [REDACTED] state that they did not understand a question or that the interpreter was not translating correctly. Therefore counsel's assertion is not persuasive. The interview was in regard to the applicant's application for adjustment of status and the interviewing officer was not required to ask the applicant's children questions.

A review of the recently submitted documentation, and the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, cannot overcome the discrepancies that were encountered during the interview on July 30, 2004.

Pursuant to section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that she is eligible for adjustment of status. Further, *Matter of Marques*, 16 I&N Dec. 314 (BIA 1977), held that when an alien seeks favorable exercise of the discretion of the Attorney General, it is incumbent upon him to supply the information that is within his knowledge, relevant, and material to a determination as to whether he merits adjustment. When an applicant fails to sustain the burden of establishing that she is entitled to the privilege of adjustment of status, her application is properly denied. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the District Director's decision will be affirmed.

ORDER: The District Director's decision is affirmed.